

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/018,137	AKERFELDT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul A Roberts	3731	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Paul A Roberts.

(3) Michael Milano.

(2) Martin Cozenza.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 December 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: Working model shown.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-24.

Identification of prior art discussed: yes.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Claim language was discussed so the claims no longer read on the Erlebacher et al. 5350399. Specifically, the language "...stretching force initiates the pushing movement". The addition of the objected elements into the specification will obviate the current 112 rejections.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required